UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,729	12/06/2004	Berislav V. Zlokovic	GRT/4061-28	9946
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 07/02/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	KOLKER, DANIEL E		
ARLINGTON,	VA 22203		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/516,729	ZLOKOVIC, BERISLAV V.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
DANIEL KOLKER	1649		

	DANIEL KOLKER	1649				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following						
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe						
for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	d within one of the follow	ving time			
periods:	of the final rejection					
 a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 		n in the final rejection, whi	chover is later. In			
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (-				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	•					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of out						
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as						
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later	than three months after the mailing d	ate of the final rejection, e	ven if timely filed,			
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. ☑ The Notice of Appeal was filed on 12 June 2008. A brief in	compliance with 27 CER 41 27	must be filed within two	months of the			
date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or an						
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	•	()				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will not be entered be	cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	v);					
(c) \square They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially r	educing or simplifying tl	ne issues for			
appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally re	jected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		ompliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [vill be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ided below or appended.					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5,6 and 27-40</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and 						
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	Sufficient reasons willy the amua	vit of other evidence is	necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a	a Notice of Appeal, but prior to th	e date of filing a brief, v	vill not be			
entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or						
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	and was not earlier presented.	See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attach	ed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application	in condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:						
	/Daniel E. Kolker, Ph.					
	Patent Examiner, Art U 6/27/08	IIII 1049				
	J , J J					

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections under 35 USC 102(b) are withdrawn in light of the amendments. Applicant has moved the limitations of previous claims 3-4 into independent claim 1. Claim 4 was not anticipated under 35 USC 102 by either Shi or Kalaria. Applicant has moved the limitations of claim 2 into independent claim 39. Claim 2 had not been anticipated by Shi. Claim 39 now requires that the patient be affected by Alzheimer's disease, which is not taught by Shi. Thus the rejections under 35 USC 102(b) have been overcome by the amendment filed 12 June 2008.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 1 - 2, 5 - 6, and 27 - 40 under 35 USC 103 is maintained for the reasons previously made of record. The arguments presented have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the reference by Grammas is limited to methods of contacting normal cells with exogenous Abeta. While the specific experiments performed by the authors did in fact use this method, the reference details the well-known changes in the morphology and physiology of endothelial cells that from patients with Alzheimer's disease as compared to normal patients. See for example Grammas, p. 126 first paragraph, paragraph spanning pp. 126 - 127, and p. 128 final paragraph. Thus the reference, combined with that by Mulliken renders obvious the instantly-claimed methods.

/D.K./